

## REMARKS

The objection to claim 24 is noted, however, the language is what is intended. As written, the claim covers the processor-based system wherein the first and second capacitors are “to reduce near and crosstalk.” It is preferred to use the “to” language since it is more in keeping with case law, including case law related to the word “adapted to.”

Claims 1-7 were again rejected under Section 102. The office action cites the material in the specification at page 1. That material, specifically at page 1, lines 10-12, is not specific to Ethernet connectors, but simply refers to types of connectors that can connect network nodes. Moreover, if it were to refer to Ethernet connectors, the phrase “standard connectors” would refer to those connectors that are standard for Ethernet. In other words, there is no reason, even under such an interpretation, to read “standard” as relating to a standard other than Ethernet when Ethernet connectors are involved.

As indicated in the attached document, relating to Ethernet connectors, Ethernet connectors must comply with RG45. See *infra* at pages 6-8.

Thus, there is simply no reason to believe that any connector can be utilized in Ethernet. Ethernet requires a specific type of connector, that connector is claimed, and the cited reference has no such thing.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-7 is respectfully requested.

Nothing in Paulson in any way suggests any of the limitations in dependent claims, such as dependent claims 3 and 4.

“Ethernet terminals” are structure. An Ethernet terminal is one that can be utilized pursuant to the Ethernet standard. It does not refer to any terminal because to do so would simply read the word Ethernet out of the claim. The Examiner should not read the word “Ethernet” out of the claim and simply read the claim on any terminal.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is not addressed in the final rejection and, therefore, no further comments can be made.


It is possible that the discussion in paragraph 5 of the office action may have intended to refer to claims 17-24. It seems that the same Ethernet connection issue is again raised.

Again, it is improper to simply read the word Ethernet out of the claims. There is absolutely no statutory basis for doing so.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2004



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]